

Art Unit: 3661

Status of the claims

1. Claims 1-16 are currently pending. Claims 1-13 are elected for examination on 8/08/2007. This Office Action is the answer to the claims filed on 2/06/2008.

Priority

2. This application claims a Japanese priority (application 2003-000622) filed in 1/06/2003.

Response

3. The examiner withdraws drawing objections due to applicants' arguments – the Office Action mailed on 6/03/2008 is also withdrawn. The concept of this invention clearly reflect on FIG. 2C of the disclosure; based on submitted claimed language (2/06/2008), the examiner submits that 35 USC 112, 2nd para., 35 USC 102 (b), and 35 USC 103(a) rejections are applied herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the simple-map image drawing unit changes the shape" in claim 6, lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of the AIPA and H.R. 2215 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in the attached Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an

application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the AIPA and H.R. 2215, applies to all qualifying references, except when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. For such patents, the prior art date is determined under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as it existed prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)).

5. Claims 1, 4, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipate by Matsuo et al. (US Pat. 7,383,127 – a continuation for US Application no. 10/175,318 filed on 6/20/2002).

A. As per independent claims 1, and 12: Matsuo et al. clearly teach a navigation system comprising:

- a monitor screen operable to display images (see Matsuo et al., FIG. 2 “VIDEO SIGNAL” outputs from “NTSC ENCODER 212”, and col. 6 lines 45-46);
- a map-image drawing unit operable to generate map image data for presentation of a map image in a window on the monitor screen (see Matsuo et al., FIG. 2 GRAPHIC PROCESSOR 211, and FIG. 10 “map data delivery center 80”);
- a simple-map drawing unit (i.e., a CPU 204 and FLASH MEMORY 209 of Matsuo et al., FIG. 2) operable to generate simple/rough map image data for presentation of a simple map image of a main road extending outside of the window (see Matsuo et al., FIG. 8 refs. 3010, 3020, and “extensive, rough map data are stored in the flash memory 209”); and
- an image combining unit (see Matsuo et al., FIG. 10 “map data delivery center 80”) operable to display the map image inside the window and the simple image of the main road outside of the window on the monitor screen (i.e., a CPU 204 and GRAPHIC PROCESSOR 211, GRAPHIC MEMORY 213 of Matsuo et al., FIG. 2); wherein the map image in the window is presented in

greater detail than the simple map image located outside of the window (see Matsuo et al., claims 1-2).

B. As per dependent claim 4: Matsui et al. also teach that a simple map image is a deformed map image that schematically shows a traveling road along which a vehicle drives, a nearest main road that first crosses the traveling road ahead of the vehicle outside the map area, and right and left main roads that extend outside the window and that cross the nearest main road at intersections on the right and left sides of an intersection of the traveling road and the nearest main road (see Matsuo et al., FIG. 8).

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

6. Dependent claims 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Matsui et al. (US Pat. 7,383,127).

A. As per dependent claim 2: The rationales and reference of rejected claim 1 are incorporated.

Matsui et al. do not explicitly disclose a name corresponding to a main road is displayed on the simple map image.

However, Matsui et al. already teach in Fig.1 about a map data delivery center 80 includes a server 81, a map database (DB) 82 for storing map data, and a point information database (DB) 83 for storing information indicating the types, names, addresses, and telephone numbers of primary facilities such as restaurants, gas stations, leisure facilities, and public facilities in respective areas of a map.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the disclosure of Matsui et al. to disclose a name corresponding to a main road is displayed on the simple map image for an advantage of easy recognition of a main road as taught about recognition of primary facilities.

B. As per dependent claim 5: Matsui et al. also teach that a simple-map image drawing unit schematically shows the nearest main road and the right and left main roads by curve lines.

The examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the disclosure of Matsui et al. to show a nearest main road and right and left main roads by straight lines for a representation to a driver because there is a clear advantage of faster processing data, and saving memory storages if representing those roads by straight lines.

7. Dependent claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Matsui et al., (US Pat. 7,383,127), in view of Loughmiller, Jr. et al. (US Pat. 4,914,605).

The rationales and reference of rejected claim 4 are incorporated.

A. As per dependent claim 8: Matsui et al. do not explicitly disclose a simple-map drawing unit detects whether a nearest main road enters a computer window.

However, Loughmiller, Jr. et al.'s could do what the applicants claim for a driving assisted device, (see Loughmiller, Jr. et al.'s navigation map with dynamic characteristics while moving along a street – col. 8 lines 35-53).

B. As per dependent claim 9: Loughmiller, Jr. et al., also teach that a drawing unit *updates a map image* when the nearest main road enters the map area.

See Loughmiller, Jr. et al., FIG. 2-1 (a dynamic transferring from window W1 to window W2), and col. 8 lines 35-53 with dynamic characteristics of a navigation map while a vehicle is moving along a street:

C. As per dependent claim 10: Loughmiller, Jr. et al. also suggest that wherein a nearest main road is drawn in map image when that road has an intersection within a distance from a vehicle (see Loughmiller, Jr. et al., col. 25 line 30 thru. Col. 26 line 7 - a navigation map with dynamic characteristics in vehicle's vicinity presentation while moving along a street.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the disclosure of Matsui et al. with Loughmiller, Jr. et al., because their navigation aid enables a driver to extract information at a glance, thereby allowing him or her to navigate while attending to the function of driving. Their invention teaches a moving map display enabling the immediate vicinity of the vehicle to be displayed at an orientation which matches the vehicle's orientation, a scale-dependent street prioritization scheme which reduces the complexity of the map presentation enabling the driver to comprehend the map at a glance, a selective and dynamic labeling scheme which also simplifies extracting map information at a glance, and enables the driver to quickly locate the position of a destination and to conveniently monitoring a driving experience.

D. As per dependent claim 11: The examiner submits that as a default setting, Matsui et al. suggest a monitor *screen is switched to display the map image on the designated scale* on the entire monitor screen on the basis of the map image data generated by the map image drawing unit.

Art Unit: 3661

8. Dependent claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Matsui et al. (US Pat. 7,383,127), in view of Applicants' Admission of Prior Art.

The rationales and reference of rejected claim 1 are incorporated.

Matsui et al. do not disclose that a main road has a rank higher than or equal to the rank of collector roads.

However, this fact is already admitted in para.[0024] of the disclosure “*Herein, main roads refer to roads above a given rank in road categories. For example, in Japan, roads are classified into the following ranks: from the highest rank, (1) national expressways, (2) city expressways, (3) national roads, (4) main local roads, (5) main local roads (designated city roads), (6) prefectural roads, (7) main ordinary roads, (8) ordinary roads, (9) narrow roads, (10) ferry routes, (11) car train tracks, and (12) others. In this embodiment, for example, roads of the ranks (1) to (4) are defined as main roads.’*”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the disclosure of Matsui et al. to disclose a main road has a rank higher than or equal to the rank of collector roads for an advantage of recognition of a statistic listing of roads, highway, second roads .etc. within a certain area.

9. Dependent claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Matsui et al. (US Pat. 7,383,127), in view of Hirai et al., (US Pub. 20020156739 A1 - Publication 10/24/2002).

The rationales and reference of rejected claim 12 are incorporated.

Matsui et al. do not explicitly disclose using a wide-area map in navigation.

However, in the same field of application, Hirai et al. already disclose about using a wide-area map in navigation (see Hirai et al., paragraph [0090]).

Hirai et al. teach that a map-data-open area is specified by a rectangle, a country, or administrative district. However, the system may be so configured that a map type (e.g., a wide area map, a detailed map, or a city map) and/or service level, e.g., only map display or map display plus guidance, can be designated in accordance with a use fee.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the disclosure of Matsui et al. with Hirai et al.'s disclosure because this makes it possible to set an area that is more suitable for a user's purposes such as display only in France, display plus guidance in Germany, and additional display of a city map in Italy.

Claim Objection

10. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. Claims 1-6, and 8-13 are not patentable. Claim 7 is objected.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-6759. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 3661

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THOMAS G. BLACK can be reached on 571-272-6956. The Rightfax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 571-273-6759.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Please provide support, with page and line numbers, for any amended or new claim in an effort to help advance prosecution; otherwise any new claim language that is introduced in an amended or new claim may be considered as new matter, especially if the Application is a Jumbo Application.

/CUONG H. NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3661